REPORT RESUMES

ED 010 603 24

DESEGREGATION AND THE NEGRO COLLEGE IN THE SOUTH. AND PERSISTENCE IN COLLEGE.

BY- ROBBINS, RICHARD
WHEATON COLL., NORTON, MASS.

REPORT NUMBER BR-5-8259 PUB DATE 66
REPORT NUMBER CRP-S-411
CONTRACT OEC-6-10-098
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$2.76 69P.

DESCRIPTORS- SOUTHERN SCHOOLS, *COLLEGES, *NEGRO TEACHERS, COLLEGE FACULTY, TEACHER ROLE, COLLEGE ROLE, COLLEGE SEGREGATION, SCHOOL SIZE, SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT, *INTEGRATION EFFECTS, EDUCATIONAL CHANGE, *EDUCATIONAL QUALITY, *NEGRO INSTITUTIONS, PERFORMANCE, NORTON

THE TRANSITIONAL CHANGES WITHIN SOUTHERN NEGRO COLLEGES, RESULTING FROM RACIAL DESEGREGATION, WERE STUDIED. THE STUDY WAS BASED ON THE ASSUMPTIONS THAT CONTINUING DESEGREGATION ACCELERATES CHANGE WITHIN THE NEGRO COLLEGE SYSTEM AND FORCES NEW ROLE ADAPTATIONS AMONG NEGRO FACULTY MEMBERS IN PARTICULAR. TO TEST THESE ASSUMPTIONS, THE AUTHOR SERVED FOR 1 ACADEMIC YEAR AS A REGULAR FACULTY MEMBER OF A LEADING NEGRO COLLEGE IN THE COASTAL SOUTH. A REDUCED TEACHING LOAD PERMITTED HIM TO VISIT THE CAMPUSES OF OTHER NEGRO COLLEGES AND TO CONDUCT INTERVIEWS WITH SOCIAL SCIENTISTS (PRINCIPALLY SOCIOLOGISTS) ON THESE CAMPUSES. QUESTIONNAIRE-GUIDED INTERVIEWS OF A 15 PERCENT SAMPLE OF THE JUNIOR CLASS AT THE "HEADQUARTERS" COLLEGE PROVIDED ADDITIONAL MATERIAL. THE STUDY RESTED PRIMARILY ON PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION AND INTERVIEWS AT THE FACULTY LEVEL, HOWEVER. THE MOST SIGNIFICANT CONCLUSION WAS THAT AFTER ONE AND A HALF DECADES OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION ACTION, THE "EDUCATION GAP" BETWEEN "WHITE" AND NEGRO SYSTEMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION REMAINS PERSISTENT, PARTICULARLY WITH RESPECT TO SMALL NEGRO COLLEGES. THE AUTHOR FOUND THAT THE FACULTIES OF THESE SMALL COLLEGES ARE USUALLY QUITE DEFICIENT IN PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION, SCHOLARLY COMMITMENT, AND INVOLVEMENT IN SIGNIFICANT SOCIAL ISSUES WHEN COMPARED TO FACULTIES OF "WHITE" SCHOOLS OF SIMILAR SIZE. THIS SUGGESTED THAT THESE NEGRO FACULTIES WERE STILL LARGELY CONDITIONED TO THE SEGREGATED SYSTEM IN TERMS OF ROLE ADAPTATION AND THAT THEIR PROFESSIONAL ROLES WILL CONTINUE TO BE PLAYED OUT WITHIN THE CONSTRICTED WORLD OF THE SMALL, ISOLATED NEGRO COLLEGE. IMPLICATIONS OF THESE FINDINGS WERE DISCUSSED. (JH)

NAA

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 5-8259 (formerly S-411)
Contract No. OE-6-10-098

U. S. [illegible] ARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This docu [illegible] reproduced exactly as received from the
person o [illegible] ginating it. Points of view or opinions
stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education
position or policy.

DESEGREGATION AND THE NEGRO COLLEGE IN THE SOUTH

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the
person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions
stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education
position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

DESEGREGATION AND THE NEGRO COLLEGE IN THE SOUTH

Project No. 5-8259 (formerly S-411)
Contract No. OE-6-10-098

Richard Robbins

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Wheaton College

Norton, Massachusetts

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was made possible in the first instance by a sabbatical leave from Wheaton College (Mass.), for which I am especially grateful to Wheaton's President, William C.H. Prentice. I am equally indebted to Jerome H. Holland and Hugh H. Gloster, President and Dean of Faculty, respectively, at Hampton Institute, Hampton, Virginia, who invited me to be Visiting Lecturer in Sociology at that institution in 1964-65. As a regular member of the Hampton faculty I was able to participate fully in the academic and social life of the college throughout the year. Friends and colleagues at Hampton contributed in numerous ways to my understanding of the Negro college system. As friend and valued critic David Riesman of Harvard University shared generously with me insights and observations from his own work (with Christopher Jencks) on Negro higher education. Finally, I am indebted most of all to the many social scientists, principally sociologists, in more than thirty Negro colleges who interrupted busy schedules to arrange extended interviews with me. This is their study as much as mine.

INTRODUCTION

The Problem and its Background

We think, rightly, of the American pattern of higher education as pluralistic and voluntaristic. A complex mosaic of colleges and universities has been built from schools which are variously large and small, affluent and resource-poor, private and public, excellent and mediocre in quality. Each year high school graduates choose or are chosen; they find a place somewhere in the mosaic. In a sense the more than 120 Negro institutions of higher learning represent a miniature version of the whole. They, too, vary widely in size, secular or religious base, level of excellence. Yet it can never be emphasized sufficiently that the Negro colleges are, additionally, the product of an inescapable and particular history, nearly a century of embattled survival in the face of racial discrimination and segregation. Their very founding, principally in the period after Reconstruction, testifies to the failure of a democratic society to provide equal educational opportunity in the general school system. Well into the twentieth century they remained under white domination: white trustees, white state legislatures, even white presidents. Northern white paternalistic philanthropy and teaching assistance counterbalanced, to a degree, Southern white paternalistic dominance and outright racism, but in the main the Negro college system remained sealed off, behind a wall of color, as much from the North as from the South. The tragic isolation of the system from the educational mainstream until comparatively recently has no parallel in the educational structure. Other special academic communities such as the elaborate Catholic college network were at least partly chosen within pluralism, not imposed by segregation.

If today a significant number of the Negro and predominantly Negro colleges[1] fall short in educational achievement or academic freedom when compared to general institutions of the same size and function, no white person cognizant of the history of white indifference and neglect should be surprised. It is in spite of the historical burden that some Negro institutions have been able to reach equivalency with comparable white counterparts while a few are clearly superior to some white colleges in the South, the region in which all but a handful of the Negro institutions are found. In any event, while every problem encountered in the total college system appears, expectably, in the Negro college system, every problem is there intensified owing to the persistent consequences of the racial restrictions of the past. History cannot be quickly undone.[2]

Nonetheless, recent changes in American race relations have been decisive enough to offset in some measure the enormous cost of racial discrimination and segregation in the past. We have been moving, however erratically and whatever the short-run regressions, toward that equality of opportunity long overdue for black Americans. These changes provide the setting for this report: desegregation and the Negro college in the South. It is impossible to recount in detail what has occurred in the last decade since the fundamental benchmark change, the unanimous Supreme Court decision declaring racial segregation in public schools unconstitutional. The reduction of racial discrimination by legal action, the enlargement of Negro voting, the expansion of economic opportunity - the record of 1954-64 is well known.[3] We need only to attend to some of the consequences of the civil rights revolution in the sphere of higher education.

Six Dimensions of the Problem

First, the solid wall of segregated higher education in the South has been breached. A small but growing number of Negroes now attend nearly all the major, previously all-white, institutions of higher learning in the region. The number ranges from less than two to more than two hundred depending on the size of the institution, its degree of traditional resistance to desegregation, its location in sub-regions of the South, and the maintenance of nearby Negro colleges as viable alternatives. The proportion of Negro students in these schools remains tiny - as is true with respect to bi-racial districts in elementary and secondary education. Racial discrimination continues on some campuses outside the classroom in matters affecting accommodations, athletics, and those social activities which are an integral part of academic subculture. The process does not yet involve faculty; less than ten Negroes are teaching in the Southern "white" college system. In no Southern state have the Negro state college units been functionally integrated with white counterparts. Nevertheless, the students are there, a symbolic advance of importance. As the numbers increase, the dramatic "first Negro" stage with its intense pressures on individual Negroes will give way to a more prosaic era and a more pragmatic generation of white college students.[4] This will be the debt owed "first Negroes."

Second, upward mobility in the lower-middle and middle class Negro community, in combination with the first really determined effort on the part of Northern educational institutions to attract and hold qualified Negroes, has resulted in increased Negro enrollment in these schools. Negroes, of course, have attended the general, interracial colleges on a scattered basis for decades. But the civil rights controversy spurred college administrations to undertake specific Negro recruitment and to establish, in cooperation with other agencies and foundations, special means of financial support to Negroes for whom this problem is even more severe than for whites in comparable class strata. In sum, without entering into the motives involved in new policies undertaken by the Northern, white, liberal establishment, we may say that the net effect is to expand the range of alternatives for college-bound Negroes primarily from a Northern urban white-collar environment.

Third, neither of the above changes has been sufficient to undermine the place of the distinctive Negro college system in the total structure. "Although the Negro colleges and universities include less than six per cent of American institutions of higher education, and their enrollments comprise less than 3 per cent of all college students, these Negro colleges enroll over half of all Negroes attending the nation's institutions of higher education."[5] These statistics, compiled in the early 'sixties, probably do not adequately reflect very recent increases in Negro enrollment in community and four-year colleges in the metropolitan North. Even so, it is doubtful that the proportion of Negro students in the Negro system will fall below one third of total Negro college enrollment. Critics of the quality of education in Negro colleges who advocate closing the weak and mediocre institutions or converting them into two-year community and junior colleges fully capable of providing specialized technical education, terminal liberal arts training, and "feeder" education into the four-year integrated college community, can make out a reasonably logical case. But sociological-historical factors alone preclude such an eventuality, except for an expected mortality of the poorest, non-accredited schools.[6]

In the Deep South every informed student of the problem knows that the Negro is not yet free to exercise the pluralistic options white students take for granted. Token desegregation will continue in the majority of white institutions of larger size while many of the smaller colleges will maintain de facto segregation, expecially in South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi. Even if racial barriers in the white academic community were to be drastically reduced, many Negro high school graduates would not be qualified for admission-a situation itself largely the result of a century of white-imposed inferior education for Negroes in the South. It is equally important to note that the average Southern Negro colleges are accessible and inexpensive. Thousands of Negroes in search of a college education in the South are excluded from, or not prepared for, the white Southern system - although the public "white" colleges belong to them, equally, with whites, as citizens of each state. They cannot afford to travel far from home to take up residence in the large metropolitan areas where the elite Negro institutions and interracial colleges are concentrated.

Moreover, historically, as already noted, the white community created and maintained what E. Franklin Frazier termed "the vested interest in segregation" in the Negro community - physical plant, staff, campus subculture. Since it has worked out no comprehensive plan for developing rapidly in the South a "vested interest in de-segregation", the white community cannot propose in all conscience a "dismantling" which would represent only half the equation. For example, many inadequately trained Negro teachers have flourished and risen inside the segregated academic community, protected from competition with their professional peers in the general system and frequently transmitting a very limited sense of their disciplines to successive generations of students. (It goes without saying that there are also poor teachers outside Negro colleges and excellent teachers and scholars inside. We speak only of an inherited historical problem, linked to race by the accident of history.) Would the Southern educational authorities and state administrations be prepared to initiate the formidable task of retraining these teachers to permit their reassignment? High school faculty desegregation, theoretically easier to accomplish in the South, is today barely under way.

Positive as well as negative aspects of the situation should be stressed. While the Negro colleges developed originally from necessity, to educate Negroes excluded elsewhere, they came, predictably, to have the same powerful social meaning for their constituencies as their white counterparts. Deep traditions were established; national fraternity, sorority, and alumnae groups were organized; pride in the continuity and achievement of particular schools was transmitted to the younger generation by the family, kinship circles, and the local Negro press. This sense of "being a Morehouse man," of participating in "the social round of Delta Sigma Theta," of returning "for our 25th" to the campus at a Hampton or Shaw, does not differ materially from that of the white world except, possibly, that in the black bourgeoisie it is more intense. It is not surprising, therefore, that for some Negro young men and women there remains a preference for the Negro college - whatever its isolation and its highly uneven academic standing - as a social community and a bridge to the adult world of jobs, marriage, and family. The preference is reinforced by educational considerations. Given the shortage of places in the total system of higher education, the Negro colleges help to meet the general need. The leading Negro institutions find their rates of applications rising in spite of some "drainage" of students to the integrated system. Indeed, even a minority of the abler students, as well as those of average ability, will continue to prefer Howard, Fisk, Morehouse, Hampton and other schools although they will be accepted at various Northern integrated institutions.

Fourth, the impact of the era of desegregation must eventually be felt on the internal structure of the Negro colleges. It is now possible for the first time to consider the prospect of a sifting-out process which will place the Negro institutions in a kind of competitive relation ship with comparable types in general academic community. The mortality of the weakest colleges, the non-accredited especially, may be anticipated. The vast majority of "average" Negro schools comprising the modal group between the weak and the elite will make use of additional public and private support to "play catch-up" in the words of the President of Southern University, Felton Clark.[8] In catching-up so far the major emphasis has been on physical plant, new buildings and facilities. But the ultimate test will hinge on the quality of education which, in turn will depend in large measure on the quality of the faculty, the crucial issue informing this report. For it is clear that the modal group of Negro colleges are "average" by virtue of a definition within the Negro academic community and that the primary task must lie in reaching parity with "average" colleges in the South and the nation within the pluralistic system described above. At the other pole, the small number of elite Negro colleges - "elite" once again in relative terms - which have graduated the overwhelming majority of Negroes of distinction in the Negro college system, already more educationally advanced, more cosmopolitan, more interracial than the others, may be expected to make the academic transition most readily. Even they, however, will not be immune from the effects of the enforced isolation and the competitive disadvantages of the past, the "stigma" of "colored college."

It follows that the question of introducing white faculty and students into the internal structure of the modal group of Negro colleges, will be pursued as a distinctly secondary goal. "Reverse integration" as it has sometimes been termed will take place within a range from extensive in the border states to minimal in the Deep South. West Virginia State and Bluefield State in West Virginia have arrived at a roughly even student balance between white and Negro from an all-Negro base in 1954; South Carolina State, permitted to hire its first white professor in 1965, had no white students up to that point.[9] But racial balance remains a derivative of education change, not the other way around.

Fifth, during the last five years a special phase of the civil rights movement, the non-violent direct action program of boycotts and "sit-ins" has contributed substantially to growing public awareness in both North and South of the Negro college network. The direct action strategy did not, of course, originate with Negro college students. Organizations such as CORE had been employing the approach as a means of combatting racial discrimination for a quarter of a century. And it came to fruition in the mid-nineteen fifties when Reverend Martin Luther King, knitting together Christian and pacifist doctrines of non-violent philosophy, led his fellow-ministers and the Negro community to success in a boycott of the segregated bus system of Montgomery, Alabama[10]. By 1960 Negro college students were familiar with Dr. King's work and could clearly see its relevance to the Southern communities within which Negro college campuses were found. For almost invariably the campuses were tucked into corners of Southern cities where "downtown", a few blocks or a few miles away, remained tightly segregated. (No study of the Negro college and its relation to both the Negro and larger white local community can be complete without a thorough understanding of the ecology of local race relations). The Negro colleges had to be largely self-contained; if public services and staff housing were not provided on campus they were normally grouped in a campus fringe area of all-Negro shops and eating places. For students to be denied service downtown, to be seated only on a segregated basis by race in movies and other public places, constituted a concrete and humiliating repudiation of the principles of equal opportunity and access learned in the classroom.

Accordingly, in 1961 when a group of students at North Carolina A. & T. in Greensboro sat-in at a downtown snack bar in order to protest against racial segregation, they released a wave of similar protest movements on Negro campuses all over the South. Not only did the students help to accelerate desegregation of public accommodations by peaceful demonstration, supplemented by court action. They brought to the attention of white public opinion across the country, apprised by press and television, the existence of a comprehensive Negro college network previously virtually "invisible" to white people conditioned to static images of work-and-song at Fisk, Hampton, and Tuskegee. More important, the students and faculty who participated developed a sense of independence and purpose, an elan, which contrasted dramatically with the ethos of conservatism and passivity many Negro college administrations had to foster in order to accomodate to white, paternalistic power and white public financial support in the South. The Negro colleges, shaken by this crisis, have now returned to the basic educational role. Their students have gone on to complex problems beyond desegregating the local drugstore such as the relationship of race to political-economic questions of power at the national level and the shortcomings in education and the excessive administrative restrictions on students within the campus community itself. But partly as a result of the Negro students' direct involvement in the civil rights movement the Negro college campus could never again be quite the tightly-controlled "safe" place it was before.[11]

Sixth, and last, the cracking of the traditional racial mold and the enlargement of the arena of desegregation has raised the prospect of changing the mobility cycle of the Negro academic man who seeks a place in the community of higher learning after graduate school. Since this is the principle theme of the present study it suffices here to state the problem in briefest summary.

Traditionally, the Negro scholar followed a pattern of attending an all-Negro college, moving out of the system briefly for an advanced degree (usually the M.A. or M.S.), then returning for the entire professional career to one or more Negro college. Individual Negro scholars of competence would return to the system with graduate degrees and than move "up and out", let us say, from North Carolina College, to Howard, to the University of Chicago. Others would complete the entire cycle from undergraduate education to professorships within the Northern, urban academic community. But both groups constituted only a small proportion to the total of Negro men and women in professional higher education.

Growing opportunities for competent Negro scholars in the general college-university network in the present era of desegration represent both a tribute to the Negro colleges (where many Negro scholars continue to take their undergraduate work) and a source of new problems for them. Previously, a return to teaching in a Negro college provided practically the only source of employment and security for the Negro academic man. Now, particularly if he has advanced training from a nationally known university, the Negro academician has an opportunity to remain with the Northern urban structure. To remain there in academics is to achieve higher salaries, lower teaching loads, better research facilities, and the possibility of national esteem in one's field. Industry, business, and government are also now more open to merit irrespective of race; these opportunities, too, are located primarily, so far, in the Northern and border Southern urban areas. The bulk of the Negro colleges lack the financial resources to compete in terms of salary and conditions of work. Moreover, they are heavily concentrated in the Deep South where a man must submit his family to still pervasive racial discrimination. It is true that some younger very able Negro scholars are impelled to return to the Negro system, at least for a time, by a strong moral obligation to bring one's professionalism back to the service of "my people" where it is urgently needed. Yet this historic commitment, on which Negro colleges have depended in the past, is restrained by a man's desire to test his ability and knowledge of his discipline in a general, rather than a special, arena.

Thus, save for elite Negro institutions strategically located in an Atlanta and a Baltimore and able to provide a measure of competitive professional opportunities in a relatively cosmopolitan setting, the Negro colleges face difficulties in recruiting younger Negro faculty, the heart of the matter in "catching up". The modal group of Negro colleges continues to have a share of able Negro scholar-teachers scattered through the system. But they are staffed with a disproportionate number of older Negro academic men, many of whom have not "kept up"; of older whites who have made an estimable moral commitment of many years standing but are near retirement or working part-time; of younger Negro scholars who are content to follow the traditional cycle and have "settled" for traditional mobility exclusively within the Negro college structure. Younger white liberals, with few exceptions, do not make a permanent commitment; they come as exchange scholars or move "up and out" after a few years.[12] The group of younger Negro scholars who are solidly trained, who would be competent teachers in _any_ college, and who have chosen to return to the Negro college structure for various reasons and in spite of the new mobility cycle, are indeed present. Some of them move through the pages of this study. _Quantitatively_, however, these Negro teachers, if they stay, form a smaller proportion of total faculty than in "white" schools of the same size. This situation, the result of all the historical forces summarized so far, may be readily grasped by a comparison of faculty depth in those Southern cities of medium size or better where two institutions are found in close proximity, one white and one Negro. The Negro college most frequently lags behind. But given the enormous advantages which the white system secured for itself for so long a time, it is remarkable that some Negro colleges in the Deep South have been able to do as well as they have in maintaining competent faculty, Negro and white. Talladega College in Alabama and Tougaloo College in Mississippi are two cases in point. They hold their own in a difficult environment.

A Note on Limits

It must be acknowledged that this study draws upon a limited and selective population within the Negro community. A large proportion of the Negro urban poor of the North and the Negro rural-urban poor of the South remain locked out of a mobility complex whose hallmark is completion of high school and entry into college. Were there no color problem, differential class factors would provide the explanation of this phenomenon. However, since the population is both black and poor, a disproportionate number of Negro poor children, including an unknown number who might have been disposed to attend college, are shunted off the education track before their individual potentialities can be ascertained. In the Northern urban ghettos too many Negro children drop out of the college-bound population too early. In the Deep South too many Negro children of low-income families, having been graduated from inferior and segregated secondary schools, are directed into the small Negro colleges nearby whose standard they can meet and whose low costs they can pay. But these "colleges" are less than colleges in view of their grave academic weaknesses and the illusory value of their diplomas. An Alcorn A. & M. in Mississippi, an Allen University in South Carolina, provide the form to low-income Southern Negroes without the substance. To talk to their students is, paradoxically to perceive poverty and deprivation at the college level.

Thus the emphasis in this report on change - on progress in civil rights, in desegregation, in equal opportunity - is tempered by the knowledge that we are here treating a special segment of the population, Negro faculty and students already "making it" from one kind of starting line, while neglecting the problem of Negroes "not making it" from another kind of starting line. To be sure, some Negroes manage to "make it" to elite Negro colleges and elite integrated colleges despite a start in urban or rural poverty. They represent individual triumps through the double barriers of race and class. It is true as well that the civil rights movement now seeks to concentrate increasingly on the problem of urban Negro poor who have in fact been losing ground relative to both white and Negro middle class strata. The Office of Economic Opportunity administers a federal program, Upward Bound, intended to stimulate children of low-income families, many of them Negro, to continue on from high school to college; estimates indicate that slightly over half of the children in the program will make the transition. Private foundations are engaged in parallel work.[13] These efforts are very modest in scope. As Kenneth Clark and other students of the problem have noted, a much more sweeping set of changes must be effected in the elementary and secondary school systems of the dark ghettos before these communities can contribute a more appropriate share of the "upward bound" and the college bound. In any case this immense challenge transcends the limits of the present study which takes the Negro college structure as it is and not as it might be.

Assumptions and Implications

Sociological research proceeds from broad assumptions to explicit hypotheses. The basic assumption governing the present study is that Negro colleges lag behind comparable colleges and universities in the general, interracial system. The reasons are historical, not racial, as previously noted. Despite the acceleration of desegregation and the enlargement of equal opportunity for Negroes in the past decade, despite the strenuous effort in many Negro colleges to apply remedial measures to the "underpreparation" of their students, it is doubtful that the educational gap can be closed within the next decade, although it will be considerably reduced for the leading Negro institutions. For even if the Negro colleges succeed in making striking internal changes in program and personnel they will still be confronted for some time to come with entering freshmen already underprepared owing to the persistence of segregated and inadequate secondary schooling for Negroes, especially in the South.

A corollary assumption is that the success of the Negro colleges in compensating for earlier student deprivation and in attempting to bring their Negro graduates into competitive equality with other graduates must depend heavily on the calibre of the teaching faculty, old and new. This means, in most predominantly Negro colleges, Negro faculty, since in only a few institutions does the proportion of white staff rise above ten per cent. How a sample of Negro social scientists is adapting to this challenge and how these academic men and women define the problems involved constitutes the core of the present work.

To fill out such assumptions requires a closer description of the Negro college system and its place in the pluralistic structure. A rough estimate is that approximately 250,000 Negroes are attending colleges and universities in the United States of whom perhaps 125,000 attend predominantly Negro institutions. Although enrollment in both systems has been rising - for example, in 1950 there were only 75,000 in the Negro colleges - Negroes still remain underrepresented by half in the total college population, for the combination of reasons cited above. It should be added that enrollment statistics, while reasonably accurate, cannot be ascertained with precision.

Difficulties arise as well in counting the number of Negro colleges and universities. The McGrath Report arrives at a total of 123 for the academic year 1963-64, but, notes some closings and mergers, some problems of the definition "white" and "Negro" if a college moves across a fifty per cent line either way, and some problems of the definition "college" for a number of junior and community colleges.[14] All but five colleges are located in the South and the District of Columbia. There are two Lincolns, one in Pennsylvania, one in Missouri; the others are Cheyney State (Pennsylvania), and Wilberforce and Central State, both in Wilberforce, Ohio. Negro schools in Delaware and Maryland are not strictly Southern geographically but they developed from the same sociological conditions as those institutions further South. In all the institutions the white students comprise a little more than 3 per cent of enrollment. However, three-fifths of the schools have no whites at all while a small minority have high proportions of white students and faculty.

The colleges are overwhelmingly undergraduate; those offering the masters' degree do so primarily in special fields of education, guidance, and practical arts. Only Howard and Atlanta Universities meet the criteria for university status in terms of graduate and professional facilities. Meharry Medical College in Nashville is exclusively for graduate medical-dental training, and there are four law schools (of mediocre quality) attached to Negro colleges in North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, and Louisiana.

A little more than half of the colleges are private but they have only a third of the total enrollment and they continue to lose enrollment in relation to the public institutions because many of the private colleges are small, struggling denominational schools, principally Baptist and Methodist. The important - and to some critics, restrictive-religious impulse in the Negro college structure reflects the efforts of the American Missionary Society and other religious groups in founding and supporting a number of the schools in the 19th century. Of the public group about 60 per cent are state-supported; the rest are locally-organized j junior and community colleges. Historically, the state schools were developed as either normal schools (later teachers' colleges) or land-grant institutions with a heavy emphasis, dictated by whites, on agricultural and industrial education, often at the expense of a minimal liberal arts program. Teachers and technicians were of course vitally needed in the Negro community but for too long a time many Negro colleges remained overcommitted to these areas in the face of a transition to a much broader view of education in the "white" A. & M.'s. Very recently the Negro teachers' colleges have become regular four year state institutions. Here Southern state educational authorities were simply following a national trend. They were also seeking to maintain segregation; Negroes who did not want to become teachers could henceforth attend their "own" liberal arts college.

It has been argued here that for all the recent changes in the reacial pattern in the last decade the Negro colleges will continue to enroll at least a thrid of Negroes in all colleges in the near future. Yet it is evident that"they are playing a smaller and smaller role in the total services of American Higher Education."[15] Presently they contribute roug-ly half of total college enrollment of Negroes and about 2.5 per cent of total enrollment in higher education. Out-migration of Negroes from the South, increased desegregation of higher education in the South, and growing Negro enrollment in Northern urban two-year and four-year colleges should reduce these proportions to roughly 35 per cent and 2 per cent respectively.

How then is it possible for the Negro system to show a continuing increase in enrollment in absolute numbers? The answer lies in the growing gap between the larger public and private colleges on the one hand and the smaller, weaker colleges and junior colleges (especially the private ones) on the others. It is the former, those with student bodies over one thousand, which are expanding. But they comprise only a quarter of the total. It is the latter, those with five hundred or fewer students, which are relatively static-and they are about half the total. Clearly the latter invite speculation as to the possibility of merger or joint operation. It has been asserted here that, for the most part, this cannot be done readily, given the traditional loyalties to schools, the built-up campus investment, the resistance to really fundamental desegregation in the white South, the lack of alternative for poor and ill-prepared Negroes in the Deep South, and - not least in importance in the religious schools - the tendency among some bishops and ministers to prize the Negro college presidency as a means of achieving prestige and upward mobility beyond the usual pastorate.

But in several specific cases reorganization would be sensible. For example, the Episcopal Church runs two small Negro colleges in adjacent states, St. Paul's in Virginia, and St. Augustine in Raleigh, North Carolina, 100 miles away. Moreover, Raleigh has another Negro college which is Baptist, Shaw University. Efforts to develop cooperative relationships between Shaw and St. Augustine have foundered. In Columbia, South Carolina, Benedict (Baptist) and Allen (African Methodist Episcopal or AME) face on a common street. Both are small and exceedingly weak. Yet administrative rivalries led some years ago to the abandonment of course exchange credits. The Atlanta University Center is the most frequently cited instance of the success of integration of independent, small units with reciprocal course exchange. It consists of the Atlanta University graduate school, Spellman College (Baptist, women,) Morehouse College (Baptist, men), Morris Brown (AME, coed), Clark College (Methodist, coed), and the Interdenominational Theological Center - all on contiguous campuses. However, the relationships do not go very deep, and independence is closely guarded. Further, Atlanta is sui generis, a large metropolis with sizable Negro resources. In smaller Southern cities it would be a matter of large, white public and private institutions entering into a new and fruitful relationship with the smaller Negro counterparts a few blocks or a few miles away, a process scarcely underway.

The problems of size and survival trace directly to the lack of financial security in the Negro College system. That, in turn, is the consequence of a history of segregation and racial discrimination. In the public realm gross inequities in state appropriations for the two systems have been reduced only to a degree. It is not far from wrong to assert that "almost any land-grant university with an enrollment of twenty-thousand or more has an annual budget that far exceeds the combined budgets of all of the Negro state colleges and the additional thirty-two private Negro liberal arts colleges being supported by the United Negro College Fund."[16] No amount of compensatory building of student centers and dormitories in the present era can cancel out the cumulative losses in effectiveness when the Negro state institutions were starved out. In the private realm church resources have not been adequate and alumnae groups have lacked the kind of financial strength taken for granted in the white system. Here again the leading colleges - Howard (private but supported very heavily by the federal government), Hampton, (heavily endowed) Morehouse, Fisk——are financially the most secure, while the smaller schools, in need of more vital changes, are the most short. Private foundations are now hesitant to support the latter group since the quality of education provided, rather than simply sheer survival in the face of segregation, is today the central issue. The foundations and the federal government tend to support the larger and better schools. The Southern Baptist church shows no signs of making use of its massive wealth to sustain and improve the Negro Baptist institutions. While the Methodist church has terminated its segregated fifth Negro jurisdiction at the national level and incorporated it into the general regional jurisdictional system, it will be many years before the effects will be felt at the local level in the South. In an era of rising costs and increasing educational demands the smaller Negro colleges will continue pinched.

It is true that the very complications of money-shortage induce the Negro colleges to provide education, food, and lodging to students at lower per-capita costs than in the general academic community. This is a necessity in any case given the lower-income levels, compared to whites, from which the student population is drawn. Yet even this"advantage" is continually narrowed. To stay in the race let alone to improve the educational program and the physical facilities, the Negro colleges are now inevitably forced to raise fees and to increase financial aid to students whose family incomes have not risen *pari passu* with that of whites. Even after a decade of marked change in which Negro family income has risen sharply compared to the Negro past, it has failed to gain in dollar value compared to the white population, as Herman Miller and others have shown. Nationally, median Negro family income is only two-thirds that of whites. Regionally - more important for our purposes since the colleges are in the South and the students come from the South - median nonwhite income is only half of white income in the South and, indeed, slightly less than half of *Negro* income in the North.[17] Financial pressures, as well as grades, contibute to a higher proportional Negro dropout rate in the Negro colleges. Negro students attending the general, interracial system, appear to have not only a much lower national dropout rate than white students but achieve roughly the same span of academic standing.[18] Even among these more motivated students, however, who in the main transcend the family income barrier, those who do drop out do so primarily for economic reasons. Negro students, very much like their white counterparts, piece together each year individual combinations of resources from work-aid-family. But they are forced to more complicated and provisional combinations, and since many of those with less money are also those less equipped by the segregated high school system to cope with the academic program, psychological pressure is intensified. If expedient remedies can be adopted by the Negro colleges themselves, and if private foundations and the Federal government can make striking increases in economic support, the basic situation will still not be fundamentally ameliorated until mammoth changes are made in Negro employment and wage-salary differentials, particularly in the South.

The final, most important, and most intangible aspect which is part of the assumption that Negro colleges are "both the same and yet different" compared to the general system, concerns the students, the faculty and the quality of the educational program. The two familiar qualifications are here reaffirmed. First, widespread variation in level of education exists in the Negro system. We need to analyze Negro colleges rather than "the Negro college", and Howard bears somewhat the same relationship to, let us say, Claflin or Morris (small Methodist and Baptist colleges in South Carolina), as a large Northern university to *its* smaller partners. (One respondent in this study, speaking freely of his arrival, finally, at a leading Negro college after having followed the traditional mobility cycle for some years observed: "Man, this is Harvard!") Second, contrary to folklore in the South, folklore which is still surprisingly prevalent in those Southern cities where the white community is well aware of "the colored college" in its midst, no genetic, racial explanation of Negro-white differentials in higher education has been scientifically sustained. The multiplicity of small, inadequate Catholic colleges in an all-white setting in the North constitutes only one example of the way in which this problem cuts across racial lines.[19]

We have already called attention to one single consideration in the qualitiative area. Because of discrimination and deprivation from first grade through high school Negro entering freshmen at Negro colleges, particularly from the South, begin higher education with noticeable gaps in background. At the outset this means that while the leading Negro colleges can now make use of national standardized admission and testing criteria in selecting and evaluating student performance, the weaker colleges are forced to maintain below-standard admission criteria in order to have students at all. (Until recently many in the latter group had no serious selection policy whatever beyond the fact of high school graduation.) Later on, the modal group, and even to a degree the leading colleges, must "pay" for the earlier policy through remedial work, above all in science, history, and mathematics. However, faculty have heavy teaching loads and, additionally, a considerable proportion among them (impossible to measure with precision) lack the competence to teach their disciplines or have failed to "keep up". Thus the remedial work is likely to be carried out under "normally" unfavorable circumstances governing the regular academic program. If the relatively high dropout rate provides a kind of delayed gate-closing, it is a harsh awakening for students who at least believed in the validity of their high school diplomas.

Drastically upgraded admission procedures would catch the problem at the outset, but economic self-interest in the mediocre to weaker Negro colleges would alone constitute a powerful barrier to tightened selection: there would not be enough students. Additionally, many administrators and faculty members would be in the paradoxical position of establishing selection procedures which, for want of adequate training in the earlier era of segregation, they themselves could not meet. But the most obvious restraint on selection commensurate with the general academic community is that in the Deep South especially it would cut off many Negroes from any college education, poor though it may be. And it would reduce the flow of teachers, administrators, and other white collar Negro college graduates into a segregated occupational structure which the white community invented in the first place and must change before it can be "shocked" at the admittedly sad state of the curriculum in some of the Negro colleges. It goes without saying that the white community must also alter the elementary and secondary system of education for Negroes in the South in order to repair underpreparation before college and in order to reduce remedialism in college afterward.

In the absence of either revolutionizing their admission procedures or of simply waiting for secondary schooling in the South to be radically transformed, the Negro colleges have chosen to raise admission criteria modestly and to concentrate instead on a variety of remedial programs: pre-freshman summer courses for high school graduates, noncredit "gateway" courses to regular coursework, intensive supplemental work during the freshman year, and special learning institutes. Nearly every Negro college in the system, with the aid of foundation and public funds, has become involved in one of these programs. The results have ranged from impressive to disappointing. Several of the colleges have adopted comprehensive cooperative arrangements with leading Northern institutions: Tougaloo-Brown, Cornell-Hampton, Michigan-Tuskegee, and others. Despite practical difficulties both types of endeavor have had positive effects. No synthesis of the studies of particular programs has yet been made. It is the present writer's observation, however, that to be more effective the remedial programs must be coupled with the larger problem of recruiting more able faculty (who, after all, do the remedying), and the exchange programs must be coupled to larger Southern institutions (which, after all, are ten rather than one thousand miles away).

Can the content of the curriculum in the Negro colleges be differentiated from that of the general system? Excluding the junior colleges because of special problems they present, we may focus on a representative sample of catalogues of the four year schools.[20] In the standard lists of majors and subjects a number of particular limitations are evident. Nearly all of them derive historically from the peculiarly restricted employment market for college educated Negroes during the long period of tight segregation in the South. Another barrier to a comprehensive curriculum is the excess of small colleges which can afford only a highly selective set of courses geared to Negro employment channels. A sex ratio overweighted on the female side forces a further narrowing of curriculum range. Negro women in the South have lacked alternatives, until very recently, to the traditional commitment to teach at the elementary and secondary levels in the dual school system or to enter such "practical arts" as home economics and nursing. The present study found a discernible trend toward a more even sex ratio, with Negro men increasingly motivated to undertake a college education as a means of access to occupational mobility. The change in sex ratio, as well as the widening arc of job opportunities for both Negro men and women, promise to induce some liberalizing of restricted curricula. But the process is a slow one.

In this context the curriculum is expectably overcommitted to teacher education and vocational-technical fields (a holdover from the "industrial education" era) - concentration shaped to job opportunities for Negroes in the South. Along the same lines specialized and advanced work in the social sciences is limited by the necessity to emphasize general preparation in "social science" and "social studies". The natural sciences suffer, except in the largest Negro colleges, not only for the reasons given above but also because of the high cost of laboratory facilities and equipment and the inability of the modal group of Negro colleges to meet the salary requirements of able, young natural scientists coming out of the graduate schools. If many of the colleges are strongest in the humanities, especially English, it must be added that much of the effort here is of a practical, workmanlike character designed to improve student basic skills in their own and foreign languages. Even the skilled and imaginative teachers lack the time, except on a scattered, individual basis, to explore the multiple themes and variations which give the humanities their richness and color.

Obviously the modal group of Negro colleges face a formidable and expensive challenge on this front. They must devise ways of attracting and holding more young men - the present ratio is twice as many women as men in many of the schools - and of providing more opportunities in liberal arts, social sciences and natural sciences for both men and women. They must reshape the traditional teacher education programs to integrate the traditional vocational emphasis with broader liberal arts training - a problem as well for "white" teachers' colleges in the process of becoming multipurpose institutions. But once again it is clear that such changes are indissolubly linked to the broader goal of improving the quality of elementary and secondary Negro education in the South - whether coterminous with increased desegregation or not. In turn, decisive change at both the college and lower levels can only be carried through if Southern states are prodded b y the Federal government. Federal guidelines, flexible but increasingly forceful, as well as massive increases in Federal money, are required. Otherwise, the effort to transform the curriculum of the modal group of Negro colleges will remain limited and highly uneven.

In one respect, however, the academic lag in the Negro college system functions as a kind of asset. The colleges are not equipped to enter the graduate school race; the costs and complexities are beyond their capacities. This enables them to resist that pressure to undertake advanced graduate education which exists in too many comparable white institutions. If there is one area in which opportunities should be expanded for Negroes in the general educational structure it is that of graduate school. Qestions of morality and justice apart, the South cannot afford a dual system of graduate and professional training. If not enough Negroes qualify for admission at this level, then Southern educational authorities must inquire into the reasons why, in the place of expanding any investment in a segregated and second-class version of the major structure. Indeed, a case may be made for reducing the commitment of the Negro colleges to graduate work in all save two or three of the largest and best institutions. Howard University's professional schools will continue, as will Atlanta University's special schools, such as those in social work and library science. (Meharry Medical College must continue in view of the desperate shortage of Negro physicians in the South. But if it is to maintain its accreditation in the face of ever-rising costs and complexities in medical education it must either convert to a public status and receive large scale support from the state of Tennessee and the Federal government or be integrated into a private university system.) In gener however, no expansion in the Negro college system at the graduate level should be contemplated. Strengthening the undergraduate curriculum presents the most effective method of assuring equal access to graduate opportunity.

It is in the area of faculty and staff resources that the division between the two systems is most apparent. If we exclude the leading five or six institutions from the total picture, the remaining colleges cannot be grouped or clustered as in the "white" academic community where in each major region there are many excellent institutions as well as average to poor ones. The present study confirms what is widely known. Faculty salaries remain lower and teaching loads higher than in comparable general colleges in the same region, although these discrepancies have been reduced in the decade 1954-64.[21] Built-in restraints inhibit the normal amount of scholarly research, publication, research leaves of absence, and participation in national professional networks. To be sure, the white academic community in the South has also been underrepresented on these indices. Only in recent years have the leading Southern institutions commenced to close the gap in recruiting distinguished scholars and promising younger academic men and women. But the situation has been compounded in the Negro system within the region by the conditions of segregation. In particular, from the first the Negro institutions were not defined as potential centers of intellectual influence and community service. State support and private funds flowed to them in a trickle compared to that given to the white-only schools.

Just as with the student body, a series of recent programs has been initiated to compensate for the segregated past. These include summer programs for teachers sponsored by the Federal government and private foundations, faculty exchanges with predominantly white institutions, refresher institutes at leading centers of graduate education, and private and public grants for research. In the future such programs are bound to increase. They have brought a considerable number of Negro academicians into contact with colleagues and mentors in stimulating, more cosmopolitan, centers of learning. But their value has been recognized as essentially auxiliary; they fit into the more fundamental task of improving the quality of education earlier in the socialization cycle. A larger, better-trained student body in a desegregated Southern educational system will constitute a larger reservoir of potential Negro faculty. Then the Negro colleges will have to be supported in competing for these students as they emerge from integrated graduate schools. Bennett College for women in North Carolina is already engaged in such an effort. Even more fundamental is the task of securing jobs and stabilized incomes for thousands of Negro families of marginal means. For it is from these families, as well as from the more slender white collar strata, that future college students and teachers will be drawn.

Hypotheses of the Study

The basic hypothesis governing this study stems from the concepts of role and role conflict in the academic community. The academic role is defined as the scholarly commitment to teaching and research within which the possibility arises of a distinctive contribution to a chosen discipline. Other social aspects of the academic role are considered secondary to this function. Role conflict develops when social change is sufficient to force a reconsideration of the traditional definition of the role; new demands, in conflict with older ones, are placed upon individuals. In the case of the Negro colleges the factor of change is represented by the breaking-up of a segregated social system in general followed by the establishment of new educational policies and programs in particular, as described above. These changes then have the effect of building up alternatives and tensions - for the academic man in the Negro college system. Can he now move from the segregated to the integrated system, and is he qualified - and does he wish - to so move? If older, and in a relatively secure position, can he be asked to meet new standards of teaching and research? If younger, can he evaluate his future in a predominantly Negro college and balance this evaluation against opportunities elsewhere in his professional world? Will a change take place in the administration's (or president's) definition of him, and in his definition of the administration? Will he become more concerned with his discipline orientation in a national setting and less concerned with his orientation to the college as a social community?[22] Will life in this academic community "go on just about as before" or will things "break differently around here"?

The study then assumes that the inevitable alterations in both the racial pattern of the general community and the educational pattern inside the special community of the Negro college will have a differential impact on the range of institutions. In essence, the basic hypothesis is that the degree of role tension and role conflict which the academic man in the Negro college will experience will vary according to the type of college in internal terms and according to the extent of racial change and desegregation in external terms. That is, the role of the faculty member is centrally dependent on what his college accomplishes educationally. But what his college accomplishes within is inseparable from what happens to "the Southern way of life" without, in the "white" community. It is the conjuncture of the two streams of change which enables us to predict a somewhat different future for a Howard University over against a Jackson State, a Fisk University over against a Claflin College, even if every Negro college remains a part of the world of the American Negro.

The most important internal indicators of the character of a given Negro college are its size, its sources of support, its public or private status, its academic quality, its social ("bourgeois") climate, and the degree of its geographical and educational isolation. The most important external indicators of the "place" of a given Negro college in the larger community setting are its location in the North, Border South, or Deep South, its involvement in a metropolitan or small-town context, its relationship to the system of racial segregation (or desegregation) which surrounds it, and its impact, if any, on the regional, and in rare cases, on the national enterprise of higher education.

In what follows the focal point of change is on the faculty member rather than on students, administration, or trustees. This represents the conviction of the writer, and the consensus of the respondents in the study, that the reputation of a college, Negro or white, rests in the first instance on the strength of its faculty. Further, the study is concerned almost entirely with Negro faculty. With the exception of one college in the sample with a large number of white personnel, the colleges had very small proportion of whites, and many of these, for one reason or another, were members of the Negro college community for only short periods of time. The system belongs to Negro teachers and Negro students.

METHODS

For a sociologist to become involved in the Negro college system, particularly if he were white, it was deemed essential that he take up a regular academic appointment at a Negro college and that he participate fully in the educational and social life of the community. This was arranged at a leading Negro college in the coastal South for the academic year 1965-66. The present writer taught both introductory and advanced students in sociology, participated in faculty meetings and on special committees, played a part in the lecture series given by the faculty, took on the role of advisor to the only student group actively concerned with domestic and foreign political issues, and entered a controversy between faculty and administration over appointment procedure which culminated in the formation of AAUP. At the same time the writer and his family lived in an all-Negro neighborhood on the edge of the campus and sent his children to a college-sponsered laboratory school overwhelmingly Negro in composition. Friends and colleagues, many of them known to the writer before his acceptance of the academic appointment, were drawn almost wholly from the Negro community.

Thus the study rests in large part on the method of participant observation carried on intensively in one college during an academic year. At the same time, the grouping of class schedules at the "headquarters" college permitted visits of two days at other Negro institutions. Altogether, forty five four-year institutions and one junior college were visited, and interviews were carried out with a combined total of seventy two Presidents, Deans, department heads and faculty members. Relevant data on these schools, located in an arc from Maryland to Mississippi, are assembled in the Appendix.

From the total of campuses visited a smaller number of schools were selected to form a representative sample of the Negro college system, and it was in these that the more important interviews were conducted. With respect to size, three categories were established - large, medium, and small - based upon enrollment figures. Both state-supported and privately-supported and privately-supported schools were included. A qualitative index of educational level was developed, with colleges rated on a four-point scale: good (4), fair (3), below average (2), poor (1).[23] Admittedly this qualitative index is crude and open to debate just as in the integrated system the ranking of such universities as Harvard, California, and Chicago also leads to sharp differences of opinion. Moreover, in the Negro system, as in others, a below average school will surprise in having one or two solid departments, while a school with great overall strength will surprise in being weak in two or three particular disciplines. Nonetheless, since colleges are constantly evaluated and ranked on an informal basis in any case, it appears worthwhile to attempt a more precise profile. In the case of the Negro colleges a preliminary sample was chosen on the basis of size, public or private status, and the present writer's own ranking, drawn from experience with the system and from such objective criteria as library strength, faculty preparation and degrees, and range of curriculum. A small panel of Negro administrator-teachers with extensive and varied experience in the Negro academic community was then asked to rate the schools within the size and private-public categories. Their assessment was compared with the preliminary estimate and, in this way, a qualitative ranking was established.

A total of 26 colleges were finally selected, 13 private and 13 public clustered in the following states: Maryland, Arkansas, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi. The final group included the full range from good to poor in quality. Although time and schedule problems precluded a wider geographic distribution — neither private nor public colleges could be covered in Louisiana, Texas, or Florida, states at too great a distance from the headquarters college - it may be assumed that a reasonably fair sampling of the system has been achieved. The list of the schools by category will be found in the Appendix.

The original intention was to develop an interview schedule and questionnaire for a sample of faculty in each of the 26 institutions, in the same vein as previous research on the American academic man.[24] The preliminary campus visits demonstrated, however, the necessity of scaling down this program. It proved to be impossible to contact and interview a faculty cross-section in the short amount of time available on each campus. A smaller, specially selected group had to be chosen. It also proved impossible to employ a formal questionnaire, primarily because in the smaller and weaker colleges faculty members were reluctant to discuss their training and background. They were also defensive about the obvious deficiencies in their colleges. And they were largely unwilling to comment on internal relations between administration and teaching staff. That the visiting sociologist was white, even though a faculty member of a fellow Negro college, created an additional barrier.

Accordingly, the decision was made to limit interviews to fellow social scientists, and more specifically to heads of social science departments and the sociologists on their staffs. (In three cases college presidents were also sociologists and in two cases deans were sociologists. Except in the largest institutions which have separate departments and chairmen for each social science, the Negro colleges maintain the older practice of a social science department with a rough division of labor among the staff.) And, in place of a formal schedule, an open-ended oral session was substituted. Both modifications benefited the study. The interviews began on the basis of a common professional interest in social science and sociology. The absence of a formal questionnaire permitted the discussion to range beyond the college to the community outside and, indeed, to racial problems in the country as a whole. Forty one interviews were held with social scientists, of whom thirty five were sociologists. Eight were white, the rest Negro. Twenty one held the doctorate, the rest the master's degree (although in some cases in social work or religion) except for three with advanced work toward the master's. There were thirty-one men and ten women in the group. Only four were below thirty five years of age; the remainder fell in the range 45-55. In general the problems of the Negro colleges were well known, familiar to interviewer and interviewed. What the social scientists accomplished was to fill in details, draw upon their own life experiences, reflect on what might have been in the segregated past and what might be in the desegregated future. They presented vivid contrasts, differing markedly in background, sophistication, and outlook. But sooner or later all returned to a common theme - the historic isolation of Negro higher education from the educational mainstream in the South.

It has been noted that no direct research was carried out with students in the Negro college system. They were seen once removed, so to say, through their faculty. Yet the colleges were built and maintained for them. Therefore, with the aid of a Negro student assistant who conducted all the interviews, the present writer undertook a study of the junior class of the headquarters college, a study based upon a 15 per cent sample of the men and women juniors. It is hazardous to generalize from one college student body to others knowing what we do about "the myth of unanimity" among college students. But at the least in one leading Negro college, rated "fair" on the qualitative index, some sense of the composition and attitudes of the student body was obtained. The questionnaire is reproduced in the appendix. Here it suffices to observe that the junior class was chosen because these students are beyond the critical sophomore stage, are well into their majors and at the same time are not yet completely preoccupied with graduation and the job market. When relevant, data are drawn from the student questionnaire to fill out the picture of faculty problems.

No claim can be entered that the methods described above resulted in a definitive study of the Negro college system. That task awaits further social change in the South as well as a much more ambitious research design which would enable members of a research team to make systematic long-range studies of selected Negro colleges for purposes of tight comparisons. The interview material and the notes drawn from participant observation may contribute, however, to the framework of such a definitive study in the future. Given the limits of time and resources, that remains the modest goal of the present work.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The writer's experience as a faculty member in a leading Negro college during an academic year, combined with a series of interviews with faculty members in a range of Negro colleges, provide the basis for the results of the study. Given the modest resources employed and the short time available it is possible that these results do not fairly represent the world of Negro higher education. Yet, acknowledging some inevitable distortion and error, it can be asserted that the following generalizations are consistent with previous research on the Negro college universe.

1. From the point of view of faculty strength the "education gap" is not primarily between the Negro and white systems in general. The gap is between the handful of leading Negro colleges and the large number of poor to mediocre Negro colleges which comprise the modal group in Negro higher education. Faculty at the few leading institutions are better prepared, more absorbed in their disciplines, more conscious of academic and professional responsibilities. They carry almost the entire burden of research and publication. They express confidence in their institution and talk about its problems in educational rather than racial terms. This is not to say that the leading institutions are without problems. Like the weaker schools they, too, have had to cope with the consequences of an earlier pattern of segregation and discrimination. But the social scientists in the sample at these schools move with relative assurance in the academic world. They have had experience both within and outside of the Negro system, and they expect their colleges to grow and develop in the future.

2. The weakness of faculty in the modal group of Negro colleges is clear and obvious. The situation is discouraging. It probably cannot be significantly improved, since it is difficult for these institutions to compete in recruiting staff, as already noted. With the exception of a small minority of outstanding teachers who happen to be at these colleges for one reason or another, the great majority of faculty members in the weaker schools appear to be marking time. Their concern is almost exclusively with teaching, which

would be laudable under ordinary circumstances, but in these colleges the teaching function is carried out mechanically. There is little interest in challenging students to work independently, and less interest in challenging administrations to initiate new policies. For their part, students are cognizant of this ethos of the status quo. Yet having invested in a college education, and looking ahead to the conferred status of college graduate and future employment, they are reluctant to "rock the boat."

This point is readily acknowledged by Negro educators. However, they go on to emphasize the fact that there are many weak white institutions which show the same characteristics: poorly equipped faculty, excessive faculty deference to autocratic administration, lack of faculty interest in scholarly pursuits, faculty apathy toward professional association (like the AAUP), corrosive self-serving and intrigue among teaching and administrative staff. That is undeniably true, and important to note since it indicates there is nothing racial in educational inferiority. At the same time, the comparison with white institutions does not alter the facts concerning the modal group of Negro colleges. Nor does the comparison contribute to the discussion of how these deficiences in both Negro and white institutions might be attacked. Candor requires the additional observation that, in a certain sense, the poor Negro colleges are "differently bad" from the poor white ones in the South. They have been trapped behind a double wall. The regional problems of the South have been everywhere compounded for the Negro South. No matter how poor a white college in the South, no matter how weak its teaching staff and its academic resources, it always took it place in the community simply because it was white. Private interests or state legislatures provided a foundation for it, whatever its failings. In the case of the poor Negro colleges, however, this tie did not exist; both their strengths and weaknesses were "invisible" to the white community. Thus, they were at a disadvantage even when compared to the below-average white counterparts.

3. Negro faculty members, in the social science sample at least, are little interested in the question of integrated staffs and student bodies. Again, the interest is greater in the larger, better schools. But on the whole the respondents do not see value in the principle of racial integration as such. The "reverse integration" at West Virginia State, Bluefield State, and Lincoln (Mo.) is not viewed as a striking innovation. The reasons for this are multiple and interrelated. They require comment because frequently white faculty members who enter the Negro college system in good faith and with expectations of the value of integrated campuses are shocked by the indifference, if not resentment, toward them.

In the first place, older Negro faculty members in particular, are aware that the whites are often better prepared professionally, and they feel threatened. There is additional hostility to white staff members because Negroes, whose mobility has been confined to the all-Negro system, know that whites are free to move anywhere in the academic circuit. It is asserted that even the dedicated whites, who have served the Negro college community for a long time and have been through the difficult years with their Negro colleagues have not had to suffer in the same way. As for the younger whites, they are perceived as transients, willing to work at a given Negro college for a short time but not permanently. Young white people also "make trouble" - they are restless with traditional administration as interpreted by Negro presidents and deans. Finally, the racial burden of the past makes it virtually impossible for the familiar give-and-take of campus social life to take place freely between white and Negro families. Relationships remain on the surface. White overtures are misinterpreted. Friendships are subject to strain. At the student level the presence of whites also poses large problems. Negro students wonder why "they" have come "here". Since campus social life is as important in the Negro colleges as in any other, dating raises additional questions. Where the colleges are located in large cities, and where there has been a tradition of integrated staff and student body, there is less tension of this kind - Howard and Fisk come to mind. But in the great majority of institutions in the South the question of integration seems remote and distant, irrespective of the advantages it might bring in terms of diversity.

4. Negro faculty members do not feel themselves accepted by the general community in their professional, academic roles. All Negro respondents reported continuing racial discrimination in housing, family employment, access to schools, hospitals, local agencies. The dramatic desegregation of public accommodations "downtown" was duly noted and attributed basically to the student sit-in movement rather than to any "give" in the white community. In the largest cities, such as Baltimore and Washington, where Negro institutions are located in a multi-group setting the discussion of racial incidents was minimal. But in the Deep South Negro respondents analyzed at great length ways in which traditional racial patterns in the general community continued to restrict them. (One chairman of a social science department in the Deep South described in moving terms the harassment of his daughter over many months in a desegregated school.) Although white faculty members escape this kind of racial exclusion by definition, the mere fact of their association with "the colored college" tends to cut them off from the general community, especially in the smaller cities in which many of the colleges are found.

Although three-fourths of the Negro respondents were willing to agree that "progress has been made in race relations" in their respective communities, the general tone was one of skepticism, and in some cases bitterness, toward the local white population. (In particular respondents stressed the conspicuous absence of any basic relationship with other "white" colleges in the same community, although they acknowledged such non-racial difficulties as time and transportation schedules and the question of the ability of their students to meet higher standards.)

In brief, it is impossible to exaggerate the importance of additional changes in race relations in the South before Negro academic men and women can play a more decisive part in serving their local communities. The enforced isolation of the Negro college in traditional Southern communities constitutes a formidable barrier to a necessary functional definition of Negro academic men and women as integral members of the total community of scholars in an Albany, Georgia, or an Orangeburg, South Carolina. Racial discrimination prevents the talents of these professionals from being employed, granted that their talents are frequently still below the level of comparable white professionals.

5. *Despite their importance in the community as professionals and their influence within Negro middle-class society, the faculty sample members are not deeply involved in politics or political organization.* If they are in some degree flattered by the attention the Negro community is at last receiving from the white bourgeoisie - the result of the growing Negro vote in the South and white uncertainty as to how it will be eventually deployed - they remain highly skeptical of coalition government with whites in their local communities. The basic reason for this seems clear to them: they do not believe the white community is ready or willing to share power in these Southern enclaves even though the Negro minority is large and voting in greater number.[25]

However, two exceptions, markedly different from each other, should be noted. Atlanta, the epitome of the "New South", increasingly cosmopolitan in structure as well as increasingly pragmatic about race relations, has worked out a *modus vivendi* between the white business and professional establishment and the Negro counterpart which includes wealthy businessmen, lawyers, doctors and leaders of the Negro academic community. Yet the "Atlanta approach", which has been of considerable benefit to both elites, has scarcely touched the surface of problems involving the Negro poor of Atlanta. More than 40 per cent Negro in composition, Atlanta contains some of the most scabrous Negro slums ever seen by the present writer in the South as well as some of the most affluent Negro suburbs in the entire nation.[26] It is doubtful that the Atlanta entente merits the nationwide praise accorded it, for all the full-scale political participation of the Negro business and professional elite.

The second example of faculty involvement in coalition government is exceedingly interesting because it is in part the work of two sociologists. Macon County, Alabama, which includes the small city of Tuskegee and Tuskegee Institute, is over 80 per cent Negro. Yet until recently it was controlled altogether by whites, both officially and on an informal basis, although Negroes were, and are, the source of the city's well-being. The prelude to change occurred when a sociologist Dr. Charles Gomillion successfully challenged the racist gerrymander of Tuskegee, carrying his case (Gomillion vs. Lightfoot) all the way to the Supreme Court.[27] This permitted a political quid pro quo to develop; Dr. Gomillion and others in the Negro political organization were able to achieve minority representation on the City Council and in city affairs. One of the new councilmen was Dr. Stanley Smith, also a sociologist and now chairman of social sciences at Tuskegee Institute. Here again coalition government involving Negro academic men seemed to point the way to the future in the Deep South. However, despite it practical effectiveness in the face of formidable political obstacles in Alabama, this coalition must be transitional in the sense that, sooner, or later, it will be transformed into black majority rule and white minority representation. Already a Negro has been elected sheriff in Macon County, a remarkable achievement in Alabama where the county sheriff is much more than a law-enforcement officer. The killing of a young Tuskegee student by a white man in 1966 touched off underlying resentment of the arrangement among younger Tuskegee faculty and the more militant students who formed an ad hoc committee in opposition to the Gomillion-Smith group and the coalition strategy. For its time, however, this program proved a valuable link between past and present; it went far beyond the traditional, dependent pattern described by Gunnar Mydral as "accommodating Negro leadership," and foreshadowed a more decisive form of Negro political organization in those atypical counties in the Deep South where Negroes still constitute an overwhelming majority.

In sum, it is too early to predict the ultimate form of Negro-white political adjustment in the South. For the time being Negro academic men and women are playing a moderate, middle-class role, maintaining lines of communication with white leaders but not challenging white power directly.

6. A few exceptions apart, Negro faculty members did not play a decisive part in the civil rights movement, although they supported demonstrations and boycotts led by students and a small number of younger faculty. There was widespread reluctance to discuss this issue, for it often represented a painful dilemma for Negro teachers, particularly in the smaller, weaker schools, more vulnerable to pressure from the white community. On the one hand, faculty members were surprised and exhilerated by The Movement; younger Negroes were quietly saying "no" to segregation and discrimination which their teachers had suffered in relative silence. On the other hand, the faculty were compelled to look to their presidents and deans who were charged with mediating between the students and the white community and who were of course responsible for faculty jobs. In a few cases Negro administrators stood firm against pressure from the white community - and in the public institutions from white state legislatures, holding the purse strings - either to "control" militancy and protest or expel certain students and fire certain faculty members. But in the majority of the colleges in the sample the Negro administrative heads did not feel themselves free to make an open and forthright commitment to The Movement. And without this lead and in a situation where normally faculty members tended

toward passive acceptance of administrative policy, a reversal of the traditional caution of the academic black bourgeoisie could not be expected. In the turbulent years of the early sixties student expulsions and faculty dismissals did take place in the smaller, weaker institutions, both public and private.

It is not the task of the present study, and in any case it would be self-righteous, to evaluate the mixed response of administrators and faculty members in the Negro college system to the civil rights crisis in the South. Many Northern white liberals were critical of administrators and faculty for not supporting the student movement more forcefully. The young Negroes most deeply involved in The Movement in the South were not on the campuses but maintained close relationships with student militants, and they were often scornful of the black academic subculture. In an extended interview, Stokely Carmicheal, then leading The Movement in Lowndes County, Alabama, and presently chairman of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), argued broadly that the Negro academic men and women on campuses in the Deep South "have failed us time after time." It suffices to observe here that, structurally, the Negro colleges in the South, the state-supported institutions in particular, have had to function within tightly defined limits or risk losing outside support for the basic task of educating young Negroes. Except for the small number of very strong Negro colleges where administrations were not compelled to adhere to the complicated and delicate rules of "caste etiquette," the colleges supported The Movement within these limits. Individual Negro faculty members, in rare instances, took their cues from militant civil rights reference groups and marched to different drummers, but the majority did not exceed the defined limits.[28]

7. The role of the academic man is one strand in the overall way of life of middle-class families.

In middle-class style of life, apart from considerations of academic scholarship or response to racial change, Negro academic families did not appear to differ appreciably from comparable white families. As husbands and wives, respondents tended to focus, predictably, on prospects for mobility, financial security, academic gossip, socialization of children and their educational future, social and religious' activities. Such differences as were apparent did not seem to stem from an obsessive and compensatory need to outdo the white subculture in status and social ritual, as Frazier and other critics of the "status-ridden" Negro academic world have charged.[29] Rather, the excessive concern for titles and formality in some colleges, the preoccupation with "partying" in the nondemominational schools and the preoccupation with rigid moralizing in the Baptist institutions, the resistance to "intellectualizing" in the pursuit of family interests and recreational activities, the tedious adherence to the most elaborate ritual possible in fraternity, sorority, and ROTC activities - these familiar elements in Negro college social life are better explained by the isolation of the system and by the limited experience of so many of its faculty members than by recourse to the thesis of the Negro community as a parody of the white, a "pathological" expression of the larger society, to use Myrdal's term. In short, the differences in style of life are historically and structurally induced, even if their consequences are measured psychologically. No one who has taught and worked in a small and relatively isolated Midwestern teacher's college would be surprised at the social tightness and parochialism of campus family life in the weaker Negro colleges. Conversely, Negroes who have grown up in the middle-class urban North and have always attended integrated schools through the graduate level, have moved with confidence in the general intellectural and professional community, whatever the special problems in coping with the common "mark of oppression," race. Young Northern, urban Negro colleagues of the writer who have taken jobs in small Negro colleges in the South report being frequently "put off" by practices in these institutions over and above the common bond of color. To be sure, as in any subculture, there are special aspects. Without in any sense sterotyping, outside observers are struck by distinctive patterns of dancing, music, "in" language, sex, drinking, kinship and friendship on Negro campuses, but these are group variations on universal themes.

The study did find, however, very marked contrast between the campus community with its fringe of middle-class families, and the poverty-stricken areas of working-class Negro families nearby. As already noted in the section on ecology, most of the Negro college campuses are tucked into corners of cities, adjacent to industrial and transportation areas; they are often middle-class islands in the midst of poor Negro neighborhoods. (Morgan State, in the center of an almost completely white, middle-class suburb of Baltimore, is a striking exception.) Until recently the two class communities did not have a real impact on each other; in fact, in the smaller colleges especially a prime social function was to protect young men and women from the "other" enviroment so antithetical to middle class values. Some of the younger, more socially conscious Negro students in the undergraduate sample, speaking in terms of rising pride in race rather than the traditional color ambivalence, made reference to the need for solidarity with the ghetto and the black poor. But this was uncharacteristic. For a majority of the students, their administration's constant reiteration of the theme of success and stability in a world of enlarging opportunities, diverts them from ideological commitment.

IN CONCLUSION

Drawing together the seven major areas explored above, it may be said in summary that the study found Negro academic men and women in the Negro college system still hampered by the racial conditions of the past. With certain exceptions in the few leading institutions, they have not yet been able to move on to a competitive position - as scholars and teachers who are Negro, not Negro scholars and Negro teachers-with their professional peers in "white" schools of comparable size and types. At the same time these faculty members are providing, with a varying degree of competence in the modal group of colleges varying from poor to fair in quality, the only college education presently available to young Negro people in various regions of the South. Therefore it appears unrealistic to consider in the near future "closing the doors" of the great majority of these institutions in the modal group. Until more fundamental changes can be made in American society, before college in the lower schools of the South and the urban North, and outside college in the employment and income situation of vast numbers of Negro parents, the modal group of Negro colleges are likely to continue as before but making whatever ad hoc improvements they can in the effort to "catch up." At the same time, at the college level, we may anticipate a continuing, if gradual, increase in the numbers of Negroes at Southern universities and colleges and at Northern, urban institutions of higher learning, particularly those catering to day and evening non-residential students.

If this report thus ends on a somewhat pessimistic note, it must be remembered that educational desegregation in the South has only been under way for a little more than a decade. Before that time the cumulative effects of racial segregation and discrimination piled up for nearly ten decades. It would be surprising if the modal group of Negro colleges, even if they possessed far greater resources than they have, could reverse quickly a historical process of such depth and magnitude. But in contemplating the proximate future there are grounds for a tempered optimism. If racial desegregation of primary and secondary schools in the South turns out to mean improvement in quality as well, Negro students will be eventually better prepared to cope with college in general. Whether the college is one of the stronger, predominantly Negro institutions which will survive beyond the transitional period of the next two decades, or is one of the integrated, predominantly white institutions which will be open to all qualified students, the choice will be theirs. It will not be imposed upon them on the basis of the color of their skin.

SUMMARY

As racial desegregation proceeds in the South, further changes are anticipated in the dual system of higher education. Negro students are gaining admission increasingly to the previously all-white but now partially integrated system in the South, as well as to Northern integrated colleges and universities. But the Negro colleges are expected to comprise at least 2 percent of total college enrollment, and at least a third of Negro college enrollment for some time to come. Accordingly it is important to understand the status transition of these institutions and to analyze the role adaptations which their Negro faculty members are making to change. A key index of Negro college strength is the ability to recruit and maintain scholars and teachers of competence who can provide their Negro (and some white) students with a sound education. With respect to this index all the Negro colleges have been handicapped in the past by a pervasive system of racial discrimination and exclusion, but it is the smaller, weaker schools - a majority of the whole - which have been the most deprived.

The study assumes that continuing desegregation accelerates change within the Negro college system in general and makes for role adaptations among Negro faculty members in particular. To test these assumptions the writer served as a regular faculty member of a leading Negro college in the coastal South during 1965-66. A reduced teaching load permitted him to visit the campuses of a sample of other Negro colleges and to conduct interviews with social scientists (principally sociologists) on these campuses. A questionnaire distributed to a 15 percent sample of the junior class at the "headquarters" college provided additional material, The study rests primarily on participant observation and interviews at the faculty level, however.

In the second decade of the era of desegregation in the South, the "education gap" between the "white" and Negro systems of higher education remains persistent. It is especially marked in the smaller, weaker institutions, the modal group. The few "elite" colleges, in contrast, while still confronted with many problems stemming from the segregated past, appear on the way to becoming schools of good quality, capable of competing relatively evenly with "white" schools of comparable size and type. The major challenge in both types of college lies in providing "catch-up" education to students who have fallen seriously behind the norm owing to inadequate lower school education for Negroes in the South. But "catching up" is further inhibited for the students by a condition common to all but the elite colleges: Except for a handful of excellent scholars scattered through the modal group of Negro colleges, the faculty is exceedingly deficient in professional preparation, scholarly commitment, and involvement in significant social issues, when compared to faculty at "white" institutions of similar size and type. In terms of role adaptation this means that faculty in the weaker schools are still largely conditioned to the segregated system; their professional roles will continue to be played out within the constricted world of the small, isolated Negro college. Only in the leading colleges, very few in number, are there signs that the role of the academic man is in transition. There, a growing emphasis on professional competence in an academic discipline can eventually result in a faculty which, whatever its racial composition or balance, can move across racial lines, in and out of the Negro college system.

It is doubtful that under present conditions the "faculty gap" can be readily closed. Most of the schools lack the resources to recruit younger, abler Negro and white scholars. In the Deep South political and educational leaders have shown little inclination to upgrade the tax-supported Negro institutions to the point where they can be functionally integrated in total, state-wide systems of higher education. Aid from the federal government and the foundations to the Negro colleges, as well as faculty exchanges with Northern institutions and special summer institutes for Negro faculty, are valuable but limited in scope. A drastic "closing the doors" of the many weak institutions might be beneficial in the long run, but in the short run in the South it would deprive Negroes of access to higher education, however limited. Therefore, it seems logical to conclude that significant changes in the Negro college structure and in the roles of its academic personnel, will be dependent on more fundamental processes involving **both** desegregation and improvement in the quality of Negro education at the lower school levels. It is from such integrated and improved high schools that Negro students in the South will be flowing into college and, thereafter, into graduate training and teaching positions in the special Negro, and the general integrated, systems.

REFERENCES

[1] The term "predominantly Negro" has recently come into vogue for two reasons. It emphasizes that the colleges are not exclusively Negro but are, in principle, "open to all." And it calls attention to the statistical fact of white students and faculty in the system. Yet significant white representation is concentrated in just a few schools in the Northern and border region. In the South, if white faculty alone are counted, the white proportion can rise as high as a quarter, since, for varied reasons, certain types of white teachers can be recruited where white students cannot be. Lincoln (Missouri) West Virginia State and Bluefield State are now more than half white in student composition; Howard, Lincoln (Pennsylvania), and Central State (Ohio) have student bodies about 20 percent white, and Central State's faculty is roughly 25 percent white. On the other hand, at Hampton Institute in Virginia, while the faculty is about 40 percent white, there are less than 100 white students in a total of 2,000. In the deeper South, with the great majority of the Negro colleges, the white student proportion becomes tiny. And such large schools as Arkansas A. M. & N. (2,800 students), Southern University in Louisiana (6,500), Jackson State in Mississippi (2,200) have no white students at all. Indeed three fifths of *all* the colleges in the system have no white students. Without denying, then, the ultimate goal of "developing a good school and not just a good *Negro* school" it seems sensible to continue the term "Negro college" for the present.

[2] The best general history is John Hope Franklin, *From Slavery to Freedom* (New York: Knopf, 1960). The comprehensive history of the separate Negro educational system is Horace Mann Bond, *Education of the Negro in the American Social Order* (New York: Octagon, 1960). On Negro higher education see E. Franklin Frazier, *The Negro in the United States* (New York: Macmillan, 1957), Ch. XVIII.

[3] For an excellent summary see Anthony Lewis, *Portrait of a Decade* (New York: Random House, 1964).

[4] It required courage and fortitude for the first Negro to gain admission to public institutions of higher learning in the South, supported by Negro as well as white taxes. James Meredith described his ordeal in Three Years in Mississippi (Bloomington: University of Indiana, 1966). Desegregation at the University of Georgia is analyzed by Calvin Trilling. Education in Georgia (New York: Viking, 1964).

[5] Earl J. McGrath, The Predominantly Negro Colleges and Universities in Transition (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965), p. 3. Severe underrepresentation applies even more at the faculty level. In New York State, as late as 1961, of an estimated 44,791 persons in college and university teaching only 52 were known to be Negro, a tenth of one percent. See Horace Mann Bond, "The Negro Scholar and Professional in America," in John P. Davis (ed.) The American Negro Reference Book Englewood Cliffs, N. J.; 1966), pp 554-587.

[6] Kenneth Clark, the distinguished social psychologist, is only one among a number of Negro educators who advocate "closing the doors" of all but the strongest colleges. In the same vein see Bernard Harleston, "The Negro in Higher Education" Harper's, May, 1966. The less critical view expressed here is developed in Richard Robbins, "Negro Colleges - What is Their Future? New South Student, April, 1966.

[7] This sense of social community, a focal point of attraction for Negroes considering college, is here viewed functionally and neutrally. However, as in the white system, there are overtones of intense status striving (exemplified, for example, in the "Boule" groups) and cultivation of "safe" middle-class values in the place of serious commitment to education and the advancement of civil rights. The most acerbic critic of the Negro colleges for fostering shallow and wasteful values in the Negro "new middle class" has been the late E. Franklin Frazier, professor of sociology at Howard University. His Black Bourgeoisie (New York: Collier Books, rev. ed., 1962) shocked and angered the Negro business and profes-

sional community. Despite an emotional approach, however, the book is substantially "the sad truth" about many of the Negro colleges in the modal group. The preoccupation with the ritual of the Negro fraternity-sorority system, under the cover of "service," is but one example of what Frazier had in mind. Frazier did exempt from the critique the minority of students in the new generation who were activists in the civil rights movement and were themselves frequently critical of their own "bourgeois" Negro elders.

[8] Quoted in Warren Penn Warren, Who Speaks for the Negro? (New York: Random House, 1965,) p. 16. President Clark has come to symbolize yet another role dilemma implicit in the relation of Negro college presidents in tax-supported colleges to Southern state legislatures and boards of education - the sources of their support. In 1960 continued student sit-ins in Baton Rouge to protest segregation led state authorities to deliver an ultimatum to Dr. Clark: curb the students or face the prospect of loss of support for Southern. Dr. Clark reluctantly complied; when Southern opened after being closed for a brief period, many of the ablest faculty and most committed students did not return. Dr. Clark has been harshly judged. See, for example, Louis Lomax, The Negro Revolt (New York: New American Library, 1963). But the essential point is that as late as 1960 a distinguished Negro educator could still be forced into a humiliating "errand boy" role by the white community. How repressively this system worked in the era of complete segregation is powerfully described in novels. See Ralph Ellison on "The Founder" in his Invisible Man (New York: Random House, 1952) and J. Saunders Redding, Stranger and Alone (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1950).

[9] Classroom desegregation, however, does not necessarily lead to campus social desegregation. At West Virginian State, for example, whites are principally day students; only a fraction are in the dormitories. Athletics apart, they do not share in campus subculture. A Negro student remarked, "Comes five o'clock we're a Negro college all over again."

[10] Martin Luther King, Stride Toward Freedom (New York: Harper & Row, 1958).

[11] The "lightning flash" impact of the sit-in movement on the Negro campus is sensitively analyzed in Howard Zinn, "A New Direction for Negro Colleges," Harper's May, 1966.

[12] An important factor in the high turnover of abler, young white faculty is their impatience with autocratic Negro administrations in many of the colleges. They have come from leading graduate schools with articulate faculty and strong AAUP's. With their own freedom of mobility they are not dependent, as are many of their Negro colleagues, on Presidents who not only control jobs on campus but are inclose touch with other administrators in the limited Negro academic marketplace. Additionally, to contest with an administration is to make more difficult an already uneasy black-white relationship on campus. It is simpler to "pull out." Yet doing so weakens the prospect for intellectual ferment so urgently needed in so many Negro colleges.

[13] A modest but important beginning has been made by the Rockefeller Foundation which provides intensive summer work for promising Negro youngsters at Princeton, Oberlin, and Dartmouth. See The Long Road to College (New York: The Rockefeller Foundation, 1965).

[14] McGrath, op. cit, Ch. 2.

[15] Ibid, p. 21

[16] Virgil A. Clift, "Educating the American Negro, in Davis (ed.), op. cit., p. 387.

[17] Data on the persistence of the employment and income gap between whites and nonwhites are abundant. See Herman Miller, Rich Man, Poor Man (New York: Crowell, 1964). See also Daniel Moynihan, "Employment, Income, and the Ordeal of the Negro Family," Daedalus, Fall, 1965. The junior class sample in the present study confirms this pattern.

[18] Kenneth B. Clark and Lawrence Plotkin, The Negro Student at Integrated Colleges (New York: National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students, 1963).

[19] The present writer assisted Professor John Donovan of Boston College in the development of a study of this problem. See John Donovan, The Academic Man in the Catholic College (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1964). It goes without saying that the "segregation" or "ghettoization" of American Catholic higher education has been less harmful to Catholic students than racial segregation to Negroes. Yet, particularly in the weaker schools in both systems, there are a number of parallels. On Catholic social transition see Richard Robbins, "American Catholics and Jews," Sociological Analysis, Spring, 1965. Interestingly, some Catholic educators are now calling for "closing the doors" of the smaller, weaker Catholic colleges, especially in the women's group.

[20] The all-Negro junior colleges and the two-year community colleges (principally in Florida) constitute a special question outside the scope of this study. Although more than a quarter of the total, they are all quite small, serving less than 10,000 students in the Negro system. On the whole they fail to provide even a minimal two-year level education, and they are poorly financed and isolated. Although some are accredited, they are viewed negatively by most Negro students as poor substitutes for a "regular" college degree. It is obvious that with the possible exception of the Chicago junior college system - which is not Negro-organized but simply has large number of Negroes attending - these schools do not share at all in the new movement to create a vital two-year college network which can simultaneously stress terminal, technical education and "feeder" education into the four-year category. The present writers knows only one junior college with any familiarity (as it happens, one of the most woeful). But discussions with Negro specialists in this field invite the conclusion that the Negro junior college structure should be abandoned and a strenuous effort made to integrate Negroes fully into the regular two-year system

which shows signs of being a stimulating and enduring experiment in American education.

[21] On the surface the teaching load in the Negro colleges seems comparable to that of equivalent integrated schools. But it is impossible to know with any statistical precision the amount of extra work and auxiliary duties performed by Negro teachers. These tasks, often assigned by the President, add materially to load. As to salary, Negro levels lag behind nationally, and in the South. However, the Negro *public* institutions are now close to similar types of "white" colleges in many states of the South.

[22] Except for the largest elite schools the Negro faculty members are overwhelmingly institution-oriented. There are, of course, a considerable number of discipline-oriented Negro scholars - but their *proportion* in the total is lower than for the "white" system. On this distinction see Theodore Caplow and Reece J. McGee, *The Academic Marketplace* (New York: Basic Books, 1958).

[23] An informal consensus exists in the Negro academic community, as in the white, on "good" and "bad" institutions. In interviews a dean tended to rate his own institution higher than the rating given to it by outsiders in similar academic posts, but once past this expected bias there was widespread agreement about placing schools. Morehouse, for example, consistently was rated highly.

[24] Cf. Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Wagner Thielens, Jr., *The Academic Mind* Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958), a comprehensive interview study of nearly 2,500 faculty members in 165 colleges. The study included a very small number of Negro colleges (6 percent).

[25] Nevertheless, it seems clear that in the South the rising Negro vote will have to be linked in coalition with moderate, liberal white groups if it is to have an impact on social change. This has already occurred in Virginia where the traditional segregationist Byrd machine has been curbed

by a new generation of white moderates who openly sought Negro support. The effectiveness, within limits, ofc coalition politics in the Southern city of "Urbania" has been described by Donald R. Mathews, *Negroes and the New Southern Politics* (Chapel Hill University of North Carolina, 1966). But in the Deep South the respondents' skepticism about coalition politics is g grounded in reality. In those medium-sized and small cities where so many of the Negro colleges are found, no sign at all appeared that a Negro "swing vote" was providing political leverage for Negro political leaders to share power with white leadership. Negro lawyers, doctors, small businessmen, and college faculty were influential within the Negro class structure but *not* across the caste-color line in the overall community.

[26] Many of the successful and wealthy Negroes in the Atlanta community are "Morehouse men" who strongly support the college. In terms of kinship and friendship there are many links between the Atlanta University academic leaders and the influential businessprofessional class. Together, these two groups dominate in the sub-community, and their firm but relatively conservative approach to white leadership gives them some influence in the general community. But noene pretends that they contribute to basic policy decisions in Atlanta. Cf. Floyd Hunter, *Community Power Structure* (Chapel Hill: North Carolina University, 1953).

[27] Bernard Taper, *Gomillion versus Lightfoot* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962).

[28] In part support for the student movement developed along generational lines; the younger Negro academic and professional people provided the strongest support, the more conservative older people (especially the older Presidents of state-supported Negro colleges) took stern measures to suppress student activity. Administrations at Alabama State, Florida A. & M., South Carolina State, Southern University, Albany State (Georgia), and a number of other state-supported institutions suspended students or induced them to cease sit-in demonstrations. Older Negro faculty members tended to acquiesce silently.

Private colleges with private resources were less vulnerable, but in several church-related schools whose administrations feared pressure from the white community (Spellman, Benedict) students were threatened with expulsion and faculty with dismissal for civil rights activity. In contrast, the President of Fisk, Stephen Wright, fully supported his Fisk students jailed for sit-in demonstrations. See Howard Zinn, _SNCC: The New Abolitionists_ (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964).

29
Frazier, op. cit., "Unlike the missionary teachers, the present teachers have little interest in "making men," but are concerned primarily with teaching as a source of income which will enable them to maintain middle-class standards and participate in Negro "society." (p. 74.)

APPENDIX A

COLLEGE CAMPUSES VISITED IN THE COURSE OF THE STUDY[1]

State	Status	Location
Alabama		
Alabama State College	(S)	Montgomery
* Talladega College	(P)	Talladega
* Tuskegee Institute	(P)	Tuskegee
Arkansas		
* Philander Smith College	(P)	Little Rock
District of Columbia		
* Howard University	(S/P)	Washington
Georgia		
Morehouse College	(P)	Atlanta
* Morris Brown College	(P)	Atlanta
Kentucky		
* Kentucky State College	(S)	Frankfort
Maryland		
* Bowie State College	(S)	Bowie
Maryland State College	(S)	Princess Anne
* Morgan State College	(S)	Baltimore
Mississippi		
* Jackson State College	(S)	Jackson
* Tougaloo College	(P)	Tougaloo
North Carolina		
Barber-Scotia College	(P)	Concord
* Bennett College	(P)	Greensboro
Elizabeth City State College	(S)	Elizabeth City
Fayetteville State College	(S)	Fayetteville
* Johnson C. Smith University	(P)	Charlotte
North Carolina A. & T. College	(S)	Greensboro
* North Carolina College	(S)	Durham
* St. Augustine's College	(P)	Raleigh
Shaw University	(P)	Raleigh
* Winston-Salem St. College	(S)	Winston-Salem

Ohio		
Central State College	(S)	Wilberforce
Wilberforce University	(P)	Wilberforce
South Carolina		
* Allen University	(P)	Columbia
* Benedict College	(P)	Columbia
Claflin College	(P)	Orangeburg
Morris College	(P)	Sumter
* South Carolina St. College	(S)	Orangeburg
Tennessee		
Fisk University	(P)	Nashville
* Tennessee A.&.I. State University	(S)	Nashville
Virginia		
* Hampton Institute	(P)	Hampton
* Norfolk State College	(S)	Norfolk
St. Paul's College	(P)	Lawrenceville
* Virginia State College	(S)	Petersburg
* Virginia College & Seminary	(P)	Lynchburg
* Virginia Union University	(P)	Richmond
West Virginia		
* Bluefield State College	(S)	Bluefield
* West Virginia State College	(S)	Institute

---

[1] Colleges marked with asterik refer to campuses where interviews with social scientists were conducted. "S" stands for state supported or public institutions; "P" for private support.

APPENDIX B

SCHEDULE FOR INTERVIEWS WITH SAMPLE OF SOCIAL SCIENTISTS

1. Could we begin with a brief description of this school beyond what's printed in the catalogue? How would you define the staff, student composition, quality of education here?

2. How about the social sciences here? How are they organized, what are the chief problems? What would you like to see accomplished? Where do sociology and anthropology fit into the picture?

3. Going back to 1954 and the Supreme Court desegregation decision do you think this and other changes in the South have made a difference in this particular college? Why or why not?

4. If you had to choose the most basic problem confronting this institution what would it be? Do you think this and other problems affecting the Negro colleges are going to be resolved?

5. How do you find the administration-faculty relationship here? Are you satisfied? Would you like to see any changes?

6. I wonder if we could look briefly at the place of the college in the community. First of all, what's the racial situation as you see it? I mean extent of segregation, discrimination in housing, schools, jobs, access to hospitals, public places - that kind of thing. Any relationship with the "white" colleges here?

7. On the same subject, how was the college involved in the civil rights movement - both staff and students - say, after 1961? What do you feel was accomplished? Where would you say The Movement is heading these days?

8. I wonder if we could use the term "power structure" for the white and Negro communities? How do you think power works in this community? Can the "white power structure" be fairly readily identified? What about Negro political power?

9. (For state-supported institutions.) Now, with desegregation, have there been any significant changes, in your opinion, in the relationship to the state legislature? What do you think the future is going to be like for this college as a state-supported institution?

10. We've covered a great deal of ground, and I'm appreciative of your time and effort. I wonder if there's anything you want to touch on in closing - this college, the Negro college system, the South today?

(Note: The material above constitutes only a rough guide to interviews. It is deliberately open-ended. Sometimes it stimulated a wide-ranging discussion; at other times it failed to move the interview beyond a rather mechanical exchange. And only in the few leading institutions were respondents willing to speak freely about problems internal to their college.)

APPENDIX C

SCHEDULE FOR STUDENT INTERVIEWS

Informational Note

The schedule which follows is part of a survey of a 15% sample of the junior class here. We are interested in the background and attitudes of a group whose members have spent three years here or have transferred into this college and thus have a basis for comparison with other institutions.

Most of the questions are noncontroversial. A smaller number explore attitudes toward the college community and the world outside.
WE WISH TO EMPHASIZE THAT ALL OF THE DATA ARE COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL AND THAT THE ANONYMITY OF THE RESPONDENTS IS ASSURED. NO NAMES ARE USED IN THE SCHEDULE. ONLY GENERALIZED MATERIAL IS MADE AVAILABLE.

We ask respondents to read the questions carefully and to answer frankly. Please request the interviewer to clarify where necessary. Where there are fixed answers choose those which come closest to your situation. In the oral sections do not hesitate to make additional comments even if not directly related to the question at hand.

A. Family Background

1. Give community and state of birth for:
   yourself
   mother
   father

2. Check community in which most time spent while growing up
   farm or village (to 2,500) ____
   small town (to 10,000) ____
   medium city (to 50,000) ____
   city (to 100,000) ____
   large city (inner core) ____
   large city (suburb) ____

3. State religious affiliation of parent(s)
   Father Mother Self
   Degree of affiliation (strong, average, weak, don't know)
   Father
   Mother
   Self

4. List father's usual occupation when you were growing up and indicate significant changes in his work career, if known.

   If mother worked, or does now, indicate job(s) held

5. Classify as accurately as you can, social position of your family in the community while you were growing up:
   middle class
   working class
   other
   upper class
   upper middle class

6. Check annual family income before taxes as you were growing up. Estimate to the best of your ability.
   less than $3,000
   to 4,000
   to 6,000
   to 8,000
   to 10,000
   to 15,000
   to 20,000
   to 25,000
   more than $25,000 ____

A. Family Background (cont'd)

7. Give no. of brothers and sisters and ages of those living.

8. List highest level of education reached by:
   mother
   father
   older brother(s)
   older sister(s)

9. Indicate present parental marital status (married, remarried, separated, divorced, widowed).
   mother
   father
   older brother(s)
   older sister(s)

10. List social, fraternal, church, other groups (ie Legion, Masons, NAACP
   mother:
   father:

11. What is the usual reading material in the home these days? (ie daily paper, bought books, library books, magazines)

12. About how many hours per week does family watch TV on the average? Do you and your parents have 2-3 favorite programs? (List)

13. Have your parents been voting over the past five years? If so, how often?
   father:
   mother:
   Indicate usual political affiliation (Dem., Rep., Ind., Other, None)
   father:
   mother:
   Is anyone in the family actively involved in politics? How?

A. Family Background (cont'd)

14. Where did you go to elementary school? How large was it? How segregated was the system of which it was a part? How much desegregation had taken place? How good were your teachers?

15. Where did you go to high school? How large was it? How segregated was the system of which it was a part? How much desegregation had taken place?

16. Briefly, how would you describe the quality of your high school education: poor, fair, adequate, good, very good, excellent. (CIRCLE) What would you say were its strongest, and its weakest, points.

17. Roughly, what was the size of your graduating high school class? Roughly, what proportion dropped out, finished, went on to college?

B. Educational Development (oral)

Now, so far, the questions have been largely informational, and general. I wonder if we could go on to your development before, and during, college. Don't hesitate to ask me to clarify or amplify.

18. Now would you say your parents raised you very strictly, strictly, relatively permissively, permissively, rather inconsistently? (Wait for devlopt.)....How did they handle moral and sexual issues?

19. Now going back to high school or even earlier did the family discuss your education, how far they wanted you to go? What did you think of these goals? How did you see them?

B. Educational Development (cont'd)

20. Going back as far as you can remember how did the family first bring up race or color? Was it after some experience they had - or you had? How did they talk about the relation of Negro people to white people? What was your reaction?

21. Talking about the same subject, race, can you recall your own earliest feelings, the first times and after when you came up against discrimination or, say, segregated facilities. Has anything changed over the years - in the situation, in yourself over the years? Take your community, say ....employment, public accommodations, schools, housing - any of these?

22. Could we touch on another minority group, for example, Jews? Did the family talk about them? Favorably? Unfavorably? Were there Jews in the community? Did the family expect anything different from them as "white people"?

23. Can I come back now to high school. Young people often have strong interests at that age. Was there a subject(s) like that for you? Or was there a teacher, or somebody prominent in national life, whom you most wanted to be like. Anything you really admired?

C. This College

24. Could you tell me when you first knew you wanted college. Did you want a Negro college first and foremost? Why or why not? How did your parents feel (and you) about: closeness to home/Negro college?

25. When you were working this out, what kind of advice did you get? Was there a good guidance setup? Did you rely on family and/or friends? How did you find out about **this college.**

26. When you applied could you tell me what schools you applied to, in order of preference? What finally happened?

27. Was your first year at college different from what you expected or not different? Explain a bit. How did you find the work? How did you find the social side, outside class?

28. How did you choose your major? Are you satisfied with it? Why?

29. How do you feel about the calibre of the faculty? Your courses? Do you think the academic program could be improved?

30. Does the administration touch your life at all? Should it be doing anything differently? Can you comment on any specific policies?

31. What is your attitude toward social life on campus? I mean dating, partying, social organizations, enjoying yourself...Do any of the rules and regulations governing this get in the way? Or are the rules about what you think they should be in a college community?

32. Do you have much time or inclination for reading (not assignments) and going to cultural events. Over the past, say 3 months what book(s), magazines, films, other events have interested you....?

C. This College (cont'd)

33. Do you have any interest in controversial, especially political, problems of the day. Who would you like to see running for President, regardless of party? How do you feel about civil rights ... the war in Vietnam... poverty program...any other issue?.....

34. May I ask one last, rather an "if" question. If you had to do it all over would you come to this college? To some other Negro college?